

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 were pending, all of which were rejected. Claims 1-3, and 6-7 have been amended. Paragraph 8 of the specification has been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected Claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 has been amended to recite “the second terminal and third terminal coupled to the first terminal of the second amplifier”. Support for Claim 2 appears, e.g., in Figs. 2 and 3 and the specification at paragraphs 19 and 23. Claim 3 has been amended to recite “the first terminal coupled to the third terminal of the second amplifier”. Support for Claim 3 appears, e.g., in Fig. 2 and the specification at paragraph 19.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to as failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Applicant submits that amended Claim 2 is clearly shown in Figs. 2 and 3. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 11, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lusher et al. (5,640,082) (“Lusher”). The Examiner stated that “Lusher discloses (figure 2) an amplifier (unlabeled), a second amplifier (117) and a variable capacitor (13).” Reconsideration is requested.

Amended Claim 1 recites “a variable capacitor disposed between the output terminal of the first amplifier and the first terminal of the second amplifier.” The claim as originally filed incorrectly stated that the variable capacitor was disposed between the output terminal of the first amplifier and the third terminal of the second amplifier. Support for the amendment to Claim 1 can be found, e.g., in Fig. 2.

Lusher is related to a switch variable capacitor circuit in general. See, the title and col. 1, lines 6-8, col. 1, lines 66-67. While Lusher discloses a capacitor 13 within the switch variable capacitor circuit, **Lusher does not teach or suggest that capacitor 13 is itself a variable capacitor.**

Moreover, the capacitor 13 is disposed between the source and drain of active switch 17 (Lusher incorrectly labels active switch 17 as “117” in Fig. 2). Thus, capacitor 13 is connected in parallel to active switch 17. See, col. 2, lines 15-16. Accordingly, **capacitor 13 is not “disposed between the output terminal of the first amplifier and the first terminal of the second amplifier” as recited in Claim 1.**

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentable over Lusher. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Claims 2, 4, and 5 depend from Claim 1 and are, therefore, likewise patentable.

Independent Claim 11 recites a method of regulating a voltage that includes “controlling the amplification of input voltage based on the first stage output voltage to produce a regulated output voltage” and “compensating for instabilities in the input voltage using a variable capacitance between the first stage output voltage and a second voltage based on the regulated output voltage.” As discussed above, Lusher is related to a switch variable capacitance circuit in general, and thus does not control the amplification of the input voltage. Moreover, Lusher does not use a variable capacitance between the first stage output voltage and a second voltage based on the regulated output voltage to compensate for instabilities in the input voltage as recited in Claim 11.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 11 is patentable over Lusher. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Claim 12 depends from Claim 11 and is, therefore, likewise patentable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 7-10, and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lusher in view of Voo (6,566,846) (“Voo”). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Voo fails to make up for the deficiencies of Lusher. Moreover, Applicant’s attorney can find no reference in Voo to the regulators being “approximately equidistant from a load

on the integrated circuit". Thus, it is unclear how Voo discloses that it is known in the art to provide a load being equidistant from a plurality of regulators.

Accordingly, Claims 7-10, which depend from Claim 1 and Claims 14-17, which depend from Claim 11, are patentable for at least the same reasons as Claims 1 and 11.

Claims 3, 6, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lusher in view of Brokaw (5,686,821) ("Brokaw"). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Brokaw fails to make up for the deficiencies of Lusher. Accordingly, Claims 3 and 6, which depend from Claim 1 and Claim 13, which depends from Claim 11, are patentable for at least the same reasons as Claims 1 and 11.

Claims 1-3, and 6-7 have been amended and Claims 1-17 remain pending. For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1-17. Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 982-8202.

Via Express Mail Label No.
EV 655 768 227 US

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Halbert
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 40,633

SILICON VALLEY
PATENT GROUP LLP
2350 Mission College Blvd.
Suite 360
Santa Clara, CA 95054
(408) 982-8200
FAX (408) 982-8210